

Application No.: 10/665,914
Dated: April 3, 2005
Amendment

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 and 11 have been amended, support for which may be found in applicants' claims 7 and 16, as originally filed, and elsewhere within applicants' specification. Claims 8 and 17 have been amended in order to provide proper claim dependency therefore. Claims 7 and 16 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. New claims 19 through 26 have been added in order to claim another aspect of the invention disclosed at page 9, line 22, through page 10, line 22, of applicants' specification.

The Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 1, 2, 10 through 12 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Veringa et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,151,896. Applicants wish to note that Veringa et al. does not disclose or otherwise teach the use of a single machined spring for the purpose of controlling displacer movement in two opposing axial directions. Rather, the Veringa et al. spring 15 is of the conventional helical wire type.

The Examiner has maintained the rejection of claims 3 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Veringa et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,151,896. With respect to the instant grounds for rejection, applicants reiterate that the spring of Veringa et al. is not a machined spring, a specific requirement of each of applicants' claims, including newly added claims 19 through 26.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 4 through 8 and 13 through 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. Although the applicants disagree with the Examiner's characterization of the relied upon references and are of the view that claims 1 through 3, 9 through 12 and 18 are patentable over those references, the applicants have amended claims 1 and 11 and have cancelled claims 7 and 16,

Application No.: 10/665,914
Dated: April 3, 2005
Amendment

without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter, in order to advance this important case to allowance. In view thereof, the applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1 through 3, 9 through 12 and 18, be removed.


Applicants further respectfully assert that new claims 19 through 26 are patentable over the references of record, including those presented in the Information Disclosure Statement filed concurrently herewith.

The additional reference cited by the Examiner as being of interest has been reviewed and found not to be pertinent to the issue of the patentability of the instant claims.

In conclusion, based upon the above, it is respectfully submitted that each of applicants' claims currently pending in the present application are in condition for allowance. Prompt notification of allowance is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 3, 2005



Michael J. Mlotkowski
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33,020
(703) 584-3270

POST OFFICE ADDRESS to which
correspondence is to be sent:

Roberts, Mlotkowski & Hobbes
8270 Greensboro Dr.
Suite 850
McLean, VA 22102